DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 230 631 UD 022 768

TITLE	Report to the Governor's Task Force on Violence and Extremism [with Executive Summary].
INSTITUTION	Governor's Task Force on Violence and Extremism, Annapolis, MD.; Maryland Univ., College Park. Survey Research Center.
PUB DATE	82
NOTE	72p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Adults; *Anti Semitism; Blacks; Housing Discrimination; *Racial Attitudes; *Racial Discrimination; *Racial Relations; Religious Discrimination; Social Attitudes; Surveys; *Violence; Whites
IDENTIFIERS	*Maryland

ABSTRACT

This paper presents the result of a statewide survey conducted by the Survey Research Center at the University of Maryland for the Governor's Task Force on Extremism and Violence. The Task Force was commissioned in response to an increased number of reported incidents associated with racial, ethnic, or religious bigotry. The survey was intended to help define patterns and possible causes of these attitudes and activities, to design a reporting system, and to create vehicles that would address the problem. A questionnaire was randomly administered over the telephone to 532 adults, Maryland State residents. Results show that: (1) while prejudice and intolerance still exist, the majority of the respondents disapproved of incidents which reflect racial or religious bigotry and felt that these incidents should be dealt with by legal means and community pressures; (2) older stereotypes of reasons for some groups' inability to do well seem to be disappearing; (3) a minority of blacks and whites expressed fear of the other racial group; and (4) the majority of whites oppose laws that prohibit interracial marriage or open housing. A comparison of this survey to similar national surveys is drawn. Racial profiles of respondents and other statistical data are provided. (AOS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED230631

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Nancy L. Cohen
Governor's Task Force

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

THE GOVERNOR'S TASK FORCE ON
VIOLENCE AND EXTREMISM

Constance Ross Beims
Chair,
Office of the Governor

The Honorable Rosalie S. Abrams
Maryland State Senator

Howard Bluth
Director
Office for Children and Youth

Michael F. Canning
Governor's Liaison to Public
Safety and Correctional Services

The Honorable Isaiah Dixon, Jr.
Maryland House of Delegates

Richard W. Friedman
Executive Director
Maryland Criminal Justice
Coordinating Council

David L. Glenn
Director
State Human Relations Commission

Dr. David W. Hornbeck
State Superintendent of Schools
State Department of Education

Dr. Sheldon H. Knorr
Commissioner of Higher Education
State Board for Higher Education

Dr. Earl Richardson
Acting Assistant to the President
University of Maryland

The Honorable Stephen H. Sachs
Maryland Attorney General

Douglas Sands
Director
Office of Minority Affairs

Rex Smith
Director
Juvenile Services Administration

The Honorable Robert F. Sweeney
Chief Judge
District Court of Maryland

Colonel Wilbert T. Travers, Jr.
Superintendent
Maryland State Police

Edwin R. Tully
Former Deputy Secretary
Maryland Department of Public
Safety and Correctional Services

HARRY HUGHES
GOVERNOR

STATE OF MARYLAND
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT
GOVERNOR'S TASK FORCE ON VIOLENCE AND EXTREMISM
STATE HOUSE, ROOM 208
ANNAPOLIS, MARYLAND 21404
(301) 269-3006

September 9, 1982

The Honorable Harry Hughes
State House
Annapolis, Maryland 21401

Dear Governor Hughes:

The Governor's Task Force on Violence and Extremism is pleased to submit to you The Maryland Survey on Violence and Extremism.

The Survey, conducted by The Survey Research Center of the University of Maryland, is part of that first important step of providing data on an issue which affects not only our present lives, but has important implications for the future quality of life in Maryland.

The Survey results have provided a first, general look at racially, religiously and ethnically motivated incidents and citizens' attitudes in the State of Maryland.

While the Survey did not ask all of the questions, nor provide all of the answers, it will serve as a font of information for the Task Force as it pursues the responsibility you have given the Task Force.

It is my privilege to express to you the Task Force's appreciation of your unstinting leadership on this issue and, as a body, we thank you for the encouragement and direction you have provided to make certain that our State in no way condones these acts which diminish each of us, personally and as citizens of the State of Maryland.

Sincerely,

Constance Ross Beims

Constance Ross Beims
Chair
Task Force on Violence
and Extremism

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND
COLLEGE PARK 20742
DIVISION OF BEHAVIORAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

SURVEY RESEARCH CENTER

Art-Sociology Building
Room 1103
(301) 454-6800

August 3, 1982

Ms. Connie Beims
Chairwoman, Governor's Task Force on
Extremism and Violence
State House
Annapolis, Maryland 21401

Dear Ms. Beims:

Enclosed is the final report from the University of Maryland Survey Research Center on the survey of racial attitudes in the State of Maryland.

It has been a pleasure to work with the Task Force in assessing some of the attitudes involved in this important issue. If we can be of further assistance, please let me know. Thank you for your assistance and support in this project.

Sincerely,

John P. Robinson

John P. Robinson
Director

JPR/jmy

Enclosure

REPORT TO THE

GOVERNOR'S TASK FORCE ON VIOLENCE AND EXTREMISM

BY THE

SURVEY RESEARCH CENTER

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND

MARCH, 1982

* The computer funds for this project were provided in full by the Computer Science Center of the University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1

METHODOLOGY OF THE SURVEY 4

Sampling 4

Procedures 5

Training 6

Analysis of Data 8

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS 10

Questions Dealing with Perceptions of the State of Race Relations 13

Questions Concerning Anti-Minority Incidents 17

General Attitudes toward Minority Groups and Minority Organizations 21

Racial Stereotypes and Segregation 23

PROFILE 30

Methodology for White Profile 30

Methodology for Black Profile 30

Background Differences on the Profile Index 35

NATIONAL SURVEYS 40

SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH 50

GOVERNOR'S TASK FORCE ON VIOLENCE AND EXTREMISM

INTRODUCTION

This report is based on the result of a state wide survey of Maryland residents done by the University of Maryland's Survey Research Center for the Governor's Task Force on Extremism and Violence. The Task Force on Extremism and Violence was appointed in May, 1981 by Governor Harry Hughes in response to an increase in the reported number of incidents generally associated with racial, ethnic, and religious bigotry.

The goals and objectives of the Task Force were specifically outlined:

(1) Through the use of appropriate sociometric techniques and survey instruments determine with all possible accuracy the dimensions of the problem of racial, religious or ethnic bias or hatred in Maryland.

(2) Design and implement an intelligent and effective public education project to sensitize our citizens to the dangers of extremism however overt or subtle its manifestations.

(3) Involve every appropriate agency of State and local government in the development of a standardized system of reporting each and every incident of violence or intimidation of a racial, religious, or ethnic nature.

(4) Employ the combined resources of law enforcement agencies, human relations commissions and the religious and educational communities to create a Statewide information service and speakers bureau readily accessible to civic, community and business groups to actively promote tolerance and understanding across Maryland.

The Task Force has spent the last year assessing the extent and depth of these incidents and the attitudes underlying them. Meetings across the State and reports from organizations in various jurisdictions have brought the manifestations of this problem into sharper focus. The value of the survey was to put these reports into more general perspective, by allowing a true cross-section of Marylanders to express their views on these issues.

The survey was intended to help the Task Force's efforts to define the problem and to examine patterns and possible causes of these attitudes and activities, as well as to suggest possible approaches to resolving the problem.

As outlined in the first of the goals and objectives above, the state of public opinion on the problem of racial, ethnic, or religious bigotry is an important ingredient in any assessment. A properly conducted survey provides an objective and a realistic approach to examining the problem in social structural terms, one which is unfortunately too often ignored by policy makers. That Govenor Hughes and the Task Force recognized the advantage of stepping outside the confines of official reports of deviant behavior and placing it in the wider perspective of the entire range of society is commendable and a valid first step in defining the problem and looking for solutions.

The Survey Research Center is pleased to have been asked to do this survey and is very proud of its contribution to the Task Force's efforts. While we recognize that one survey can hardly provide all the answers, nor ask all the questions, it is part of that important first step of providing data for the State of Maryland about an issue which affects not only our present lives but which has such important implications for the future quality of life in Maryland.

Together with the Task Force, the Survey Research Center staff spent considerable time defining what we wanted to look at in this first "snapshot" of public opinion on the issue. Naturally, with the perfect vision of hindsight, there are other questions we wish we had asked and other areas we wish we had had room for in the questionnaire. Nonetheless, our survey instrument contains a wealth of data and information that we did not have before on which we can build. It was also built on the "state-of-the-art" of opinion data on

racial attitudes, drawing on items from national polls (such as the Washington Post/ABC Poll and the General Social Survey from the University of Chicago.) The advice and help of Tom Smith at the General Social Survey, Howard Schuman of the University of Michigan and Barry Sussman of the Washington Post were especially important in this regard.

On behalf of the SRC staff and myself, I would like to thank the subcommittee of the Task Force, who worked most directly with us, for their cooperation and enthusiasm: Michael Canning, Richard Friedman, David Hornbeck, David Glenn, and Rex Smith. Particular thanks to Connie Beims, Chairwoman of the Task Force, for her support.

My special thanks to the interviewing staff of the Survey Research Center, who took on this project with personal concern and brought to it consistently high quality throughout.

Sue Dowden
Project Director

METHODOLOGY OF THE SURVEY

The survey questionnaire was administered to individuals over age 18 in a random probability sample of households in the State of Maryland. Interviewing was conducted during the period from November 15, 1981 to January 15, 1982. The resulting sample included 532 citizens; of whom 406 identified themselves as "white" or Caucasian, 111 as "black" or Negro and the remaining 15 classified as "other" (mainly people of Oriental background).

Sampling

The sample was selected from a framework listing developed at the Center of all working telephone exchanges and subexchanges in the State. All telephone exchanges were grouped first by region and county in the state; counties were stratified from rural to suburban to urban. A systematic sample was chosen from these subexchanges (first four digits of the telephone number) in each of these strata. The last three digits of the telephone number were generated from a random number table.

Only residential households were interviewed. For each household that was contacted, a random selection was made for the particular respondent to be interviewed in that household. That selection was based on the number of persons over 18 living in that household. Thus, the person answering the phone was not necessarily the desired respondent; the desired respondent might be the "oldest female" or the "youngest male" etc. in the household depending on the random selection schedule for that household. While this did mean an increased number of call-backs to reach the desired respondent in each household, it was essential

to the representativeness of the sample in terms of all people in the state with access to a telephone having an equal chance of being part of the sample. Thus being a respondent is no more likely among those who normally answer a phone or only those eager to talk.

Procedures:

Confidentiality and anonymity was assured to each respondent in the introductory part of the interview. Following standard professional procedures names of respondents are never asked and if they are volunteered, they are never recorded. Full telephone numbers are destroyed after the questionnaire is coded for computer data entry; only the telephone exchange and subexchange are coded and retained.

Telephone calls were made seven days a week during the interview period at various times of the day; appointments for call-backs to respondents sometimes occurred as early as 7:30 a.m. (one interview was completed at 2 a.m. in the morning!). The following charts show the distribution of days of the week and times of the day interviews were conducted:

Day of Week Interview Completed

Category Label	Code	Absolute Freq.	Relative Freq (PCT)
Monday	1.	67	12.6%
Tuesday	2.	82	15.4
Wednesday	3.	74	13.9
Thursday	4.	90	16.9
Friday	5.	38	7.1
Saturday	6.	101	19.0
Sunday	7.	80	15.0
	TOTAL	532	100.0%

Time of Day Interview Completed

Category Label	Code	Absolute Freq.	Relative Freq (PCT)
Morning (before noon)	1.	14	2.6%
Afternoon (noon-6 pm)	2.	258	48.5
Evening (after 6 pm)	3.	259	48.7
NA	9.	1	.2
		532	100.0%

All telephone interviews were conducted from the Survey Research Center's centralized telephone bank located in College Park, Maryland. Shifts of interviewers were supervised, and all interviews were edited and periodically monitored by an experienced telephone supervisor. This helped ensure a high degree of quality control and consistency of interviews done throughout the project.

Training:

The Survey Research Center used a two-tiered approach for training interviewers: all interviewers first receive six hours of classroom instruction on general interview techniques and their importance, and an additional two hours of training and practice on the specific instrument for a project. On-the-job training continues with supervisor monitoring and critique of the first few actual interviews. Interviewers are also given supplemental training when necessary.

All of the interviewers employed on this project had already been through the classroom training, and had experience on at least one previous statewide telephone survey using the random-digit-dial method. A total of 13 interviewers (4 male, 9 female; 10 white, 3 black) were employed on the project.

Completed interviews in this project ranged from 10 minutes in length to a maximum of 60 minutes; the average length was about 25 minutes. The refusal rate on the project was 22%, about 2% higher than the average for surveys done by the Center. This slightly higher refusal rate was in some part due to the sensitivity of the questions asked; some non-completions occurred after the beginning of the concentration of racial attitude questions, approximately 5 to 10 minutes into the interview.

Although every precaution is taken, as described above, to obtain a representative sample of the state, randomness is no guarantee of absolute representativeness. Nonetheless, our surveyed respondents did match well with population estimates of the proportion of males, college educated, elderly, etc. in the state. For example, the regional breakdown of our respondents match up rather well with the most recently available (1980) Census figures.

Region	Sample	1980 Census
Baltimore City	21.4	18.7
Baltimore County	14.8	15.5
Prince George's	14.3	15.8
Montgomery	12.6	13.7
AA-Howard	14.8	11.6
West - (Carroll, Federick, Garrett, Washington, Allegany)	9.2	10.2
East - (Harford, Cecil, Eastern Shore, St. Mary's Calvert, Charles)	12.8	14.3

Analysis of Data

Four general approaches have been taken in the analysis of data for this particular report:

(1) The simple distribution of responses to each question. This is the most basic use of poll data, namely to characterize public opinion as falling on one side of the issue or the other: The proportion of Marylanders who disapprove of cross-burnings; or the proportion who oppose inter-racial marriage.

(2) The relation of these question responses to background factors in the public. Survey results can examine the relationships of opinion to background factors such as age, education, and regional characteristics of the people who are interviewed. Do younger people disapprove of cross-burnings more than older people? Do people who live in the Western part of the state oppose inter-racial marriage more than those in other parts of the state?

(3) The relation of opinion to "purified" background factors in the public. Since almost all background factors are or can be related to one another (for example, education level and income), some way must be found to separate the effects of different variables from each other. The most commonly used technique is multiple regression analysis; one variant of this technique, particularly useful in survey research, is Multiple Classification Analysis (MCA), a computer program developed at the University of Michigan's Survey Research Center (Andrews, et. al. 1969).

The main advantage of MCA is that it not only gives a value for each categories of a background variable (i.e. those aged 18-29, those aged over 65) related to the opinion to be explained but also an adjusted or "purified" value taking into account the effects of any other factors that are entered into the analysis. Thus if young people are more opposed to cross-burnings, that may be a function of their usually having more education than older

people. The age effect, then, may be a disguised education effect and age *per se* would be irrelevant in terms of opinion.

(4) Comparison with national surveys. When question wording is the same, comparisons can be made to national, or other, surveys. This usually is done in terms of the simple distribution of responses to a questions, since the complete national data are not always available or comparable. A caution must be made, however, in that no national data exist for the same exact time period of our Maryland survey.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

"Seems racial bit is never gonna end..."

"It's an attitude ... can only occur in change of heart of individuals... show disapproval ... maybe it could be done away with ..."

"I teach kindergarten: that age is not prejudiced. They learn it later from family and peers."

Quotes from respondents in the Maryland Survey

It would be wonderful to be able to say that prejudice and intolerant attitudes no longer exist, but the reality of the world is that they do exist. What is reassuring from this study is that the overwhelming majority of citizens in our sample disapprove of incidents which reflect racial or religious bigotry and feel these incidents should not be tolerated but be dealt with by legal means and community pressures.

It is also encouraging to see that the older stereotypes of reasons for some groups not doing as well as others seem to be disappearing. Most people in this sample see no difference between the races in a person's trying to get ahead or his dependability; one respondent's opinion expressed the feelings of many: "Race makes no difference, people must be judged on what they themselves are." Blacks are seen as doing less well because of social, motivational, and educational advantages, not genetic factors.

A minority of Blacks (9%) and Whites (13%) did express a fear of the other racial group, but the reasons given for this fear differed for the two races: Whites mentioned "fear of crime" most frequently as the reason for their fear; Blacks mentioned economic disadvantages or discrimination against Blacks by Whites as their major reason for fear.

Whites about Blacks: "I fear them harming people." "...being robbed, being raped..." "If that Black needs money, I'd fear for my wallet."

Blacks about whites: the main fear about Whites comes up: "...only when you try to get ahead on your job."

When asked if they had heard of any racial or religious incidents, almost three-fourths of all respondents had heard of such incidents, usually through media reports. Very few reported knowing about these events from first hand knowledge and only one respondent reported any direct knowledge of the persons involved.

In response to the question "Why do you think these incidents are occurring?", "ignorance" and "bad attitudes" were mentioned most frequently as explanations, although some respondents went on to give more than one explanation. Economic problems, usually in terms of unemployment or "hard times", was another frequent explanation (12% of the sample mentioned this reason first and an additional 5% gave economics as a second response or an extension of their first response). The Ku Klux Klan was mentioned by 6% of the respondents and by an additional 2% of those giving more than one response to the interviewer.

Less than 1% of the respondents approved of such activities, although 9% of the total sample expressed a "don't care" attitude. When asked their perceptions of the government leaders attitudes in Washington and Annapolis, 46% of respondents felt "don't care" expressed the attitudes in Washington while only 26% felt this same description applied to Annapolis. Very few respondents perceived government leaders as approving of such incidents; less than 3% perceived leaders in either Washington or Annapolis as viewing these incidents positively.

The general social legislation over the last twenty years was seen as more beneficial to Blacks (by a 7 to 1 ratio of better-worse opinions) than to Whites (1.2 to 1 ratio of better-worse opinions). Over twice as many Whites felt anti-Black feelings had <u>decreased</u> than felt they had increased over the last five years. Whites opposed laws which would prohibit interracial

marriages or open housing by a 5 to 1 margin.

The following tables give the responses for questions asked on the survey; where applicable, responses are broken out by the total sample, the White subsample and the Black subsample.

Questions Dealing With Perceptions of the State of Race Relations

Generally speaking, both Black and White respondents expressed more positive than negative sentiments about the state of race relations in this state. More than twice as many respondents in the survey (40%) said there was less anti-Black feeling in the areas in which they lived than said there was more anti-Black feelings (16%). That proportion was slightly lower for Blacks than Whites, but the general trend of feelings was in the positive direction.

The results were about the same for anti-Jewish feeling, with 29% feeling that there was less anti-Jewish sentiment in their area compared to only 9% who felt there was more. Again the sentiment predominated both among Whites and Blacks.

Opinions were not as optimistic for perceptions of the likelihood of racial violence. More respondents felt that the chances of white violence against Blacks had increased (35%) over the previous five years than decreased (14%), and also that the likelihood of Black violence against Whites had increased (27%) than decreased (22%). Blacks were more likely than Whites to see the likelihood of Black violence increasing, while Whites were far more likely than Blacks to see the risk of White violence. This could be an important point of misperception

Whites and Blacks also differ significantly on the main beneficiaries of the legal changes that have been enacted in this Country over the last twenty years. While 82% of Whites feel that these changes have made things better for Blacks, only 61% of Blacks do. At the same time, as 33% of Whites feel that these changes have made things better for Whites, some 53% of Blacks do. In other words, Whites feel that these changes have benefited Blacks and not Whites; most Blacks, on the other hand, feel these changes have benefitted Whites about as much as they have Blacks.

10. In the area where you live, do you think today there is more, less or about the same amount of anti-Black feeling among whites as compared to 4 or 5 years ago?

Category	Totals (N=532)	Whites (N=406)	Blacks (N=111)
More	15.6	14.3	19.2
Same	44.6	45.3	42.4
Less	39.8	40.4	38.4
DK	(51)	(38)	(10)

11. In your own area close-by, are the chances for violence by Blacks today greater, less, or about the same as four or five years ago?

Category	Totals (N=532)	Whites (N=406)	Blacks (N=111)
Greater	26.6	24.5	36.9
Same	51.2	54.6	38.8
Less	22.1	21.0	24.3
DK	(34)	(25)	(7)

12. What about white people in your area, do you think the chances for violence by Whites today are greater, less, or about the same as four or five years ago?

Category	Totals (N=532)	Whites (N=406)	Blacks (N=111)
Greater	34.6	38.2	21.0
Same	51.0	51.1	51.0
Less	14.4	10.8	28.0
DK	(35)	(22)	(10)

13. Now how about anti-Jewish feeling in the area where you live, do you think today there is more, less, or about the same amount of anti-Jewish feeling compared to 4 or 5 years ago?

Category	Total (N=532)	Whites (N=406)	Blacks (N=111)
More	8.8	7.8	12.6
Same	61.9	66.0	49.4
Less	29.2	26.2	37.9
DK	(110)	(84)	(22)

19. Over the last twenty years, there have been many changes in the laws regarding employment, housing, and education. Do you think these changes have made things better, worse, or have made no difference for black people?

Category	Totals (N=532)	Whites (N=406)	Blacks (N=111)
Better	77.3	82.0	61.1
Worse	10.1	8.6	25.9
No Difference	12.6	9.4	13.0
DK	(31)	(28)	(1)

20. How about for white people ... do you think these changes in laws regarding employment, housing, and education have made things better, worse, or have made no difference for white people?

Category	Totals (N=532)	Whites (N=406)	Blacks (N=111)
Better	37.2	32.6	53.5
Worse	32.8	33.7	17.8
No Difference	29.9	33.7	28.7
DK	(38)	(28)	(8)

21. Do you think the presence of Spanish speaking people in Maryland has made things better, worse, or has made no difference for Black people?

Category	Totals (N=532)	Whites (N=406)	Blacks (N=111)
Better	6.9	5.9	10.9
Worse	69.4	25.7	20.7
No Difference	23.7	68.4	68.5
DK	(149)	(128)	(18)

Questions Concerning Anti-Minority Incidents

About three-quarters (72%) of respondents in the survey had heard of incidents in Maryland of cross-burnings, swastika paintings or the like. White respondents were slightly more likely to have heard of these incidents than were Black respondents. Almost all respondents (93%) agreed that something should be done about these incidents, most recommending law enforcement procedures.

Respondents gave a wide variety of explanations for why these incidents were occurring:

"There are alot of crimes now...The Klan died until about 5 years ago, but now the Klan has been in the uprise... and there's a lot of publicity about it. Blacks are still the lowest on the totem pole and a lot of Whites resent Blacks still."

"Bunch of people can't face reality that Blacks are as good as Whites...want to keep it a White world."

"Probably times are hard...People need scapegoats."

"Economic conditions gets bad, irrational people are able to surface."

"White backlash of more conservative middle class Whites who are tired of footing tax bill."

"Because people aren't understanding each other."

"We are becoming a more violent society now."

"T.V. media is over reacting ... building kids... kids see and hear about these things and go out and do it for kicks."

"Too much competition for not enough jobs ... low incomes ... fighting..."

"Part of it is the economy ... have something to do .... many people looking for scapegoats. Some people don't like Blacks moving into neighborhoods."

"People are crazy...overreacting to poor conditions."

"Because of drugs and alcohol. When people don't have jobs there is frustation."

Almost all respondents in the survey also personally disapproved of these activities, although almost 10% of respondents said they didn't have much opinion one way or the other on the issue. Interestingly, Whites were not much less disapproving of such activities than were Blacks. While few respondents saw leaders at the state or national level approving of such incidents, substantial proportion perceived them as not caring much one way or the other. Almost half (46%) saw that as the reaction from Washington and 26% as the reaction from Annapolis.

14a. Have you heard anything about any incidents in Maryland this year (since January 1, 1981) of cross-burning, painting swatikas on buildings or any other activities of this kind?

Category	Totals (N=532)	Whites (N=406)	Blacks (N=111)
Yes	71.5	72.7	68.5
No	28.5	26.8	31.5
DK	(6)	(3)	(0)

14c. Should anything be done about these incidents?

Category	Total (N=532)	Whites (N=406)	Blacks (N=111)
Yes	93.2	91.4	100.0
No	6.8	8.6	0.0
DK	(25)	(19)	(5)

16a. Would you say to strongly approve, approve, disapprove, or strongly disapprove of cross-burning as an activity, or don't you car much one way or the other?

Category	Totals (N=532)	Whites (N=406)	Blacks (N=111)
Strongly Approve	0.0	0.0	0.0
Approve	.4	.3	1.0
Disapprove	34.1	35.8	27.6
Strongly Disapprove	56.2	54.5	63.8
Don't Care	9.4	9.4	7.6
DK	(16)	(11)	(3)

17. How do you think the people who run government in Washington feel about these types of incidents? Do you think the leaders in Washington strongly approve, approve, disapprove, strongly disapprove, or don't you think they care much one way or the other?

Category	Totals (N=532)	Whites (N=406)	Blacks (N=111)
Strongly Approve	.4	0.0	2.1
Approve	1.8	.6	5.3
Disapprove	36.4	41.0	22.1
Strongly Disapprove	15.3	17.7	6.3
Don't Care	46.0	40.7	64.2
DK	(72)	(56)	(12)

18. How do you think the people who run the State government in Annapolis feel about these types of incidents? Do you think the leaders in Annapolis strongly approve, approve, disapprove, strongly disapprove, or don't you think they care much one way or the other?

Category	Totals (N=532)	Whites (N=406)	Blacks (N=111)
Strongly Approve	0.0	0.0	0.0
Approve	2.7	1.2	7.7
Disapprove	48.1	50.0	42.9
Strongly Disapprove	23.1	26.5	11.0
Don't Care	26.1	22.4	38.5
DK	(78)	(56)	(18)

General Attitudes Toward Minority Groups and Minority Organizations

These attitudes were determined using a "feeling thermometer," on which respondents could register their views on a scale going from a coldest possible feeling of 0^{o} to a 100^{o} reading for the warmest possible response.

Except for particular organizations, like the Ku Klux Klan or the Moral Majority, feelings on this thermometer scale were generally on the positive end of the scale but not at the top. Thus, Whites rated "white people" 78.9^{o} on the average. While they rated black people ten degrees lower on the scale -- 68.6^{o}, they rated Orientals (67.2^{o}) and Hispanics (63.1^{o}) even lower. Whites also rated Jews (71.3^{o}) lower than they rated Whites in general.

Moreover, Black respondents rated Black people (81.4^{o}) higher on average than they did White people in general (73.2^{o}). In other words, Blacks rated Blacks 8^{o} higher than they did Whites, compared to the 10^{o} higher rating Whites gave to Whites. Thus, there does not appear to be that much greater antagonism of Whites towards Blacks than vice-versa. Blacks also gave White people higher ratings than they did to Jews (71.3^{o}), to Hispanics (71.1^{o}) and to Orientals (70.0^{o}).

More interesting and sometimes larger differences between Whites and Blacks emerged in this thermometer ratings for other groups and organizations. Black respondents rated "poor people", "Southerners", and the "NAACP" more warmly than did White respondents. Surprisingly, they also rated the Moral Majority and the Nazi Party more warmly than Whites. On the other hand, Black respondents rated the police lower than did White respondents.

For this next question, I would like to get your feelings about some groups in the State. I would like you to picture in your mind a thermometer, with the score of 0 representing a cool or unfavorable feeling toward the group and 100 representing a warm or unfavorable feeling toward the group.

If you have a cool feeling toward the group, you should give that group a score somewhere between 0 and 50; if you have a warm feeling toward that group, then you should give it a score somewhere between 50 and 100. If you don't feel particularly warm or cool toward the group, you should place that group in the middle of the thermometer, at 50 degrees.

Total Sample (N=532) (average)	Group	Whites (N=406) (average)	Blacks (N=111) (average)
75.0	Poor People	72.2	84.6
69.2	Southerners	68.7	71.8
74.8	Catholics	74.7	75.8
76.9	Police	78.5	70.7
74.7	Protestants	75.7	71.3
70.5	Jews	70.4	71.3
77.5	Whites	78.9	73.2
71.2	Blacks	68.6	81.4
67.7	Orientals	67.2	70.0
47.4	Moral Majority	43.9	62.0
64.8	Hispanics	63.1	71.1
10.5	Nazi Party	8.7	17.6
58.4	NAACP	52.8	79.4
8.9	Ku Klux Klan	8.9	9.7

Racial Stereotypes and Segregation

Relatively small minorities of Whites (16% and 14% respectively) agreed that there should be laws prohibiting White-Blacks intermarriages or open housing. Some 44% of Whites, however, agreed that Blacks should not push themselves where they were not wanted.

Relatively few Whites also agreed with certain Black stereotypes, namely that White people are more dependable or try to get ahead more; in both instances, over two-thirds of Whites felt there were no racial differences on these characteristics. The same sentiments were expressed with regard to whether Blacks tried to take advantage of White people or whether Blacks could not be trusted. Far more Whites felt that Blacks were trustworthy and were fair in their personal relationships. Only 13% of Whites felt they had "anything special to fear from Blacks", although 29% said they would go out of their way to avoid driving through Black neighborhoods and another 10% felt they would under some circumstances.

Black respondents generally gave much the same "no difference" responses to these questions as Whites did. Higher proportions of Blacks who did feel they were differences felt that Blacks came out better on these factors, but less than half of those with such opinions felt that Blacks tried to get ahead more or were more dependable. Black respondents were also more likely to feel that Whites would take advantage of them than Whites were of; but Blacks were just as likely as Whites to feel that members of the opposite race could be trusted.

White respondents in the survey were asked to provide explanations for why Blacks in general lived under more adverse social circumstances than Whites. The rank order of agreement was as follows:

Don't have chances for education	56%
Lack of motivation or will power	47%
Begin life with less advantages	36%
Discrimination	31%
Less in-born ability	20%

In other words, more Whites were willing to accept "external" than "internal" reasons for the disadvantaged situation of Blacks, particularly the external reason of access to education; advantages of birth and discrimination were not as acceptable external reasons for the situation. While the "internal" or personal reason of motivation was accepted by half of the White respondents, only one in five accepted genetic inferiority as a reason for Black's less advantaged position in society.

Do you think there should be laws prohibiting marriages between blacks and whites?

Category	Whites (N=406)
Yes	16.4
No	83.6
DK	(14)

Would you say you agree or disagree with this statement: Black people should not push themselves where they're not wanted.

Category	Whites (N=406)
Agree	44.4
Disagree	55.6
DK	(32)

a) Would you say you agree or disagree with this statement: White people have a right to keep blacks out of the neighborhoods whites live in and blacks should respect that right.

Category	Whites (N=406)
Agree	14.3
Disagree	85.7
DK	(14)

b) Would you say you agree or disagree with this statement: Black people have a right to keep whites out of the neighborhoods blacks live in and whites should respect that right.

Category	Blacks (N=111)
Agree	1.9
Disagree	98.1
DK	(1)

R4. On the average, black people (in this State) have worse jobs, income, and housing than white people. Do you think these differences are

a) Mainly due to discrimination?

Category	Whites (N=406)
Yes	30.5
No	69.5
DK	(29)

b) Because most blacks have less in-born ability to learn?

Category	Whites (N=406)
Yes	20.3
No	79.7
DK	(24)

c) Because whites begin life with so many more advantages?

Category	Whites (N=406)
Yes	35.9
No	64.1
DK	(23)

d) Because most blacks don't have the chance for the education it takes to rise out of poverty?

Category	Whites (N=406)
Yes	55.8
No	44.2
DK	(11)

e) Because blacks don't have the motivation or will power to pull themselves out of poverty?

Category	Whites (N=406)
Yes	46.9
No	53.1
DK	(42)

R10. In general, do you yourself feel that you have anything special to fear from white people?

Category	Blacks (N=111)
No	90.9
Yes	9.1

R11. In general, do you yourself feel that you have anything special to fear from Spanish speaking people?

Category	Blacks (N=111)
No	94.1
Yes	5.9

R12. Also, in general, do you yourself feel that you have anything to fear from Oriental people?

Category	Blacks (N=111)
No	96.0
Yes	4.0

R8. Generally speaking, do you think that most white people can be trusted, or that you can't be too careful in dealing with white people?

Category	Blacks (N=111)
Most can be trusted	42.3
Can't be too careful	17.3
No difference	39.4
DK	(5)

R9. Do you think that black people would try to take advantage of you if they got a chance or would they try to be fair?

Category	Whites (N=406)
Take advantage	16.2
Try to be fair	50.7
No difference	33.2
DK	(20)

R9. Do you think that white people would try to take advantage of you if they got a chance or would they try to be fair?

Category	Blacks (N=111)
Take advantage	27.1
Try to be fair	31.8
No difference	41.1
DK	(3)

R10. In general, do you yourself feel that you have anything special to fear from black people?

Category	Whites (N=406)
No	87.5
Yes	12.5

R5a. On the whole, do you think white people or black people try to get ahead more, or don't you think that race makes any difference in how much people try to get ahead?

Category	Whites (N=406)	Blacks (N=111)
White	29.5	13.1
Black	1.8	9.3
No Difference	68.7	77.6
DK	(14)	(1)

R6. Who do you think are more dependable -- white people, black people, or doesn't race make any difference?

Category	Whites (N=406)	Blacks (N=111)
White	20.4	9.3
Black	.3	8.4
No Difference	79.4	82.2
DK	(9)	(2)

R7. If you were driving through neighborhoods in a city, would you go out of your way to avoid going through a section were black people lived?

Category	Whites (N=406)
No	59.9
Yes	29.2
Qualified	10.8
DK	(1)

R8. Generally speaking, do you think that most black people can be trusted, or that you can't be too careful in dealing with black people?

Category	Whites (N=406)
Most can be trusted	50.7
Can't be too careful	15.0
No difference	34.3
DK	(21)

PROFILE

The second part of our analysis will be to try to summarize our description of most and least tolerant respondents in terms of an index to see what background characteristics generally are associated with these two extremes.

Methodology for White Profile

Our first profile is for White respondents (N=406); those who answered "white" or "caucasian" to the question, "What is your race?" Thirteen attitude questions were selected for inclusion on an index of tolerance (see Table I). Each question was recoded to scores of 0 to 1, 0 reflecting a less tolerant answer, 1 reflecting a more tolerant answer. Each person's score on the thirteen variables was then added, excluding the codes which represent a "don't know" or no response to a particular question. This gave a possible range of scores from 0 (a person would have a 0 score of each of the thirteen variables or on all the questions that particular person answered) to a 13 (a 1 on each of the 13 variables). The lower the score, then, the less tolerant a person on this index and the higher the score, the more tolerant a person on this index.

The mean score of responses for this distribution is 9 and the median is 9. This distribution seems consistent with the description discussed earlier of attitudes in and across the State.

Methodology for Black Profile

Nine attitude questions were selected for inclusion on an index of tolerance for Blacks (Table II). Again, each question was recoded to scores of 0 and 1, 0 reflecting a less tolerant answer, 1 reflecting a more tolerant answer. Each person's score on the nine variables were added, excluding the codes which represent a "don't know" or no response to a particular question, giving a possible range of 0 to 9. The lower the score, the less tolerant a person on the index and the higher the score, the more tolerant a person on this index.

TABLE I

VARIABLES FORMING INDEX OF TOLERANCE - WHITES (N=406)

(1) Would you say you strongly approve, approve, disapprove, or strongly disapprove of cross burning as an activity, or don't you care much one way or the other?

0=strongly approve, approve, don't care
1=strongly disapprove, disapprove

(2) If you have a cool feeling toward a group, you should give that group a score somewhere between 0 and 50; if you have a warm feeling toward a group, then you should give it a score between 50 and 100. If you don't feel particularly warm or cool toward the group, you should place that group in the middle of the thermometer, at 50 degrees. (mean of temperature towards Blacks by Whites = 68.6)

0=000 to 068 1=069 to 100

(3) Do you think there should be laws prohibiting marriages between Blacks and Whites?

0=yes 1=no

(4) Would you say you agree or disagree with this statement: Black people should not push themselves where they're not wanted.

0=agree 1=disagree

(5) Would you say you agree or disagree with this statement: White people have a right to keep Blacks out of the neighborhoods Whites live in and Blacks should respect that right?

0=agree 1=disagree

(6) On the average, Black people (in this State) have worse jobs, income, and housing than White people. Do you think these differences are: because most Blacks have less in-born ability to learn?

0=yes 1=no

(7) Do you think these differences are:because Blacks don't have the motivation or will power to pull themselves out of poverty.

0=yes 1=no

(8) On the whole, do you think that White people or Black people try to get ahead more, or don't you think that race makes any difference in how much people try to get ahead?

0=Whites 1=No difference, Blacks

(9) Who do you think are more dependable -- White people, Black people, or doesn't it make any difference?

0=Whites 1=No difference, Blacks

(10) If you were driving through neighborhoods in a City, would you say you would go out of your way to avoid going through a section where Black people lived?

0=yes 1=no

(11) Generally speaking, do you think that most Black people can be trusted, or that you can't be too careful in dealing with Black people?

0=Can't be too careful 1=Most can be trusted, No difference

(12) Do you think that Black people would try to take advantage of you if they got the chance or would they try to be fair?

0=Take advantage 1=Try to be fair, No difference

(13) In general, do you yourself feel that you have anything to fear from Black people?

0=yes 1=no

For the distribution of Black respondents, the mean and the median was 7.

Several cautions immediately occur when attempting to compare the Black Profile with the White Profile: The Black sample size is small, only 111, and particularly, in the subcategories (points on the index) the subsample size becomes even smaller. For example, only 2 persons scored a "3" on the index and only 2 scored a "4". It is difficult to generalize or to feel confident hypothesizing from such small sample sizes. Also, the number of variables used on the two profiles are different: 13 for the Whites and 9 for the Blacks. However, for comparative purposes this difference is not as significant, as long as we understand the make-up of the indices and the smaller sample sizes.

On the whole, the Black population appears to be more tolerant as a group than the White population. Whether this would hold with a larger sample of Blacks is an issue open to replication, but it does seem plausible that a group which has experienced discrimination personally would be more sensitive to tolerant attitudes toward others.

Two questions, appearing on both indices, illustrate the differences between the two groups:

On the whole, do you think White people or Black people try to get ahead more, or don't you think that race makes any difference in how much people try to get ahead?

Responses	Blacks	Whites
Less Tolerant	9.3	29.5
More Tolerant	90.7	70.5

Who do you think are more dependable -- Black people, White people, or doesn't it make any difference?

Responses	Blacks	Whites
Less Tolerant	8.4	20.4
More Tolerant	91.6	79.7

TABLE II

VARIABLES FORMING INDEX OF TOLERANCE - BLACKS(N=111)

(1) Would you say you agree or disagree with this statement: Black people have a right to keep Whites out of the neighborhood Blacks live in and Whites should respect that right.

0=agree 1=disagree

(2) On the whole, do you think white people or black people try to get ahead more, or don't you think that race makes a difference in how much people try to get ahead?

0=Blacks 1=No difference, Blacks

(3) Who do you think are more dependable -- Black people, White people, or doesn't it make any difference?

0=Blacks 1=Whites, No difference

(4) Generally speaking, do you think that most White people can be trusted, or that you can't be too careful in dealing with White people?

0=Can't be too careful 1=Can be trusted, No difference

(5) Do you think that White people would try to take advantage of you if they got a chance or would they try to be fair?

0=Take advantage 1=Try to be fair, No difference

(6) In general, do you yourself feel that you have anything special to fear from White people?

0=Yes 1=No

(7) In general, do you yourself feel that you have anything special to fear from Spanish speaking people?

0=yes 1=no

(8) Also, in general, do you yourself feel that you have anything to fear from Oriental people?

0=yes 1=no

(9) If you have a cool feeling toward a group, you should give that group a score somewhere between 0 and 50; if you have a warm feeling toward that group, then you should give it a score somewhere between 50 and 100. If you don't feel particularly warm or cool toward the group, you should place that group in the middle of the thermometer, at 50 degrees. (Mean of temperature feel towards Whites by Blacks = 73.2)

0=000 to 073 1=074 to 100

More Whites show a less tolerant attitude on these questions than do Blacks. Generally, trying to get ahead and dependability are job-related characteristics and it is in the economic or job-related areas that Blacks mention reasons to fear Whites.

One other question shows this difference also and, interestingly, it is in the area which Blacks also mentioned as reason for fear - discrimination.

> Would you say you agree or disagree with this statement: White (Black) people have a right to keep Blacks (Whites) out of the neighborhood that Whites (Blacks) live and Blacks (Whites) should respect that right?

Responses	Blacks	Whites
Less Tolerant	1.9	14.3
More Tolerant	98.1	85.7

Background Differences on the Profile Index

Returning to the comparison of the profiles, we will examine five variables -- age, sex, education level, income and region of the State in looking at the distribution of the categories for these variables, we will need to separate out the effects of each of these variables because these variables are often so closely related (education and income, for example).

For Tables III and IV, we have used Multiple Classification Analysis (MCA), a variant of multiple regression, to look at the devistions of the categories in each variable from the mean of each of the two profiles. As discussed earlier, MCA has the advantage of giving a value for each category of a background variable which is "purified" for the effect of other factors entered into the analysis. The "unadjusted" column of figures given for each profile shows the deviations before these other factors are taken into consideration; the second column, the "adjusted" or "purified" deviations are taking the effects of the other variables into consideration.

For the age category of 18-19, the unadjusted figure is -.81, which when subtracted from the grand mean of 9.31 gives the average 18-19 year old a score

of 8.50 on the profile. However, the adjusted figure takes into account the fact that younger people have lower education levels and lower incomes. Taking these factors into account, this group still scores lower (-.23) than the entire White sample as a whole. The third column, the beta score (.22), is a measure of correlation of the two items -- the index score of tolerance on the profile and age. Thus it is the "purified" correlation, that is, it takes the effect of the other variables into consideration on a scale from .00 (no relation) to 1.00 (perfect relation).

For the White sample, we find the strongest correlations between the index and age, and between the index and education level. It appears, with the exception of the 18-19 year old group, that the older age groups are the less tolerant. However, this does not seem to be true of the Black sample in our study: here the less tolerant groups appear in the 20-29 year old category, and among those over 70.

Higher education level is also related to more tolerant feelings, although the least tolerant group appears to be those with some high school education rather than those with only a grammar school education. Among Blacks, however, the college educated group seems to be the least tolerant. (Possibly those feelings we are calling intolerant might alternatively be defined as assertiveness; from that perspective, higher educated Blacks may be exhibiting a sense of assertiveness rather than racial intolerance).

Independently of their lower education, White respondents with less income were more intolerant than other Whites; however, respondents with highest incomes were not much more tolerant than average. Lower income Blacks were more tolerant than middle income Blacks.

There were also some interesting differences by region of the State. Among Whites, those in Baltimore City and in the Eastern Shore area expressed least tolerant attitudes, while those in Prince George's, Anne Arundel and Howard Counties expressed most tolerant views -- after correction for the demographic

factors that distinguish residents of these regions. Among Blacks, more tolerant attitudes were expressed by those in the suburban counties and less tolerant attitudes in the more rural parts of the State.

Generally speaking, differences between men and women on the index was not large. However, there was an interesting cross-over racially: White women expressed more tolerance than White men, Black men expressed more tolerance than Black women.

TABLE III

MULTIPLE CLASSIFICATION ANALYSIS ON THE INDEX OF TOLERANCE
WHITES (N= 406)

****

GRAND MEAN = 9.31

VARIABLE + CATEGORY	N	UNADJUSTED DEV'N	ETA	ADJUSTED FOR INDEPENDENTS DEV'N	BETA
AGE					
1 18-19	10	-.81		-.23	
2 20-29	87	.29		.22	
3 30-39	93	.93		.80	
4 40-49	53	.14		-.23	
5 50-59	55	-.56		-.49	
6 60-69	39	-1.16		-.88	
7 OVER 70	28	-1.24		-.66	
			.28		.22
SEX					
1 MALE	181	-.07		-.27	
2 FEMALE	184	.07		.27	
			.02		.10
EDLVL					
1 GRADES 0-4	2	-.31		.63	
2 GRADES 5-8	25	-1.23		-.28	
3 SOME HS 9-11	32	-1.50		-1.16	
4 HS GRADE 12	129	-.21		-.39	
5 SOME COLL 13-15	66	-.26		-.26	
6 GRAD COLL	58	1.12		.98	
7 17+	53	1.11		1.01	
			.32		.26
INCOME					
1 UNDER 5000	31	-1.12		-.48	
2 5-10,000	38	-.86		-.40	
3 10-15,000	52	.17		.21	
4 15-20,000	57	-.19		-.08	
5 20-25,000	45	.25		.35	
6 25-30,000	35	.46		.09	
7 OVER 30,000	107	.39		.04	
			.19		.09
REGION					
1 BALTO CITY	53	-.29		-.52	
2 BALTO COUNTY	66	-.19		-.19	
3 PRINCE GEORGE	33	.66		.64	
4 MONTGOM	57	.36		.09	
5 ANNE ARUNDEL-HOWARD	57	.51		.46	
6 WEST	45	-.27		.21	
7 EAST	54	.50		-.40	
			-.40		.14

TABLE IV

MULTIPLE CLASSIFICATION ANALYSIS ON THE INDEX OF TOLERANCE
BLACKS (N=111)

****

GRAND MEAN = 7.35

VARIABLE + CATEGORY	N	UNADJUSTED DEV'N	ETA	ADJUSTED FOR INDEPENDENTS DEV'N	BETA
AGE					
1 18-19	10	.85		.72	
2 20-29	31	-.38		-.40	
3 30-39	33	.08		.11	
4 40-49	13	-.50		-.06	
5 50-59	13	.58		.65	
6 60-69	4	.40		.37	
7 OVER 70	3	-.68		-2.42	
			.28		.35
SEX					
1 MALE	38	.15		.25	
2 FEMALE	69	-.08		-.14	
			.07		.12
EDLVL					
1 GRADES 0-4	2	-.35		2.29	
2 GRADES 5-8	7	-.49		-.72	
3 SOME HS 9-11	19	.44		.52	
4 HS GRADE 12	52	.17		.01	
5 SOME COLL 13-15	16	-.53		-.26	
6 GRAD COLL	5	-.95		-1.43	
7 17+	6	-.01		.23	
			.24		.33
INCOME					
1 UNDER 5000	11	.11		.31	
2 5-10,000	24	.32		.46	
3 10-15,000	19	-.56		-.56	
4 15-20,000	16	.03		-.15	
5 20-25,000	11	.20		.07	
6 25-30,000	8	.78		.04	
7 OVER 30,000	18	-.40		-.13	
			.25		.22
REGION					
1 BALTO CITY	46	-.02		-.15	
2 BALTO COUNTY	5	.25		.20	
3 PRINCE GEORGE	35	.25		.45	
4 MONTGOM	2	1.15		2.35	
5 ANNE ARUNDEL-HOWARD	11	-.53		-.43	
6 WEST	2	-.35		-.69	
7 EAST	6	-.85		-1.38	
			.22		

NATIONAL SURVEYS

Comparison to National Surveys

Many of the questions in the Maryland racial survey were taken from those used in national surveys. This allowed us not only to employ questions that had already been fully field tested in other surveys but to make comparisons between attitudes in the state of Maryland and in the nation as a whole.

The most complete and long-standing series of racial attitude questions are those that have been asked by the General Social Survey (GSS) conducted by the National Opinion Research Center of the University of Chicago. Surveys have been conducted yearly from 1972-1978 and in 1980 and 1982. Samples are drawn independently in each year of the survey (approximately 1500 each year) of English speaking persons 18 years of age or over in the continental United States. Some questions on this data appear every year while others rotate years; a few are asked only in a single survey. For the past ten years, the GSS has been asking a series of policy-oriented racial attitude questions dealing with such topics as open housing and school desegregation. For the three of these questions included on our survey, attitudes of white Marylanders were considerably more tolerant than the rest of the county:

- Only 16% of Marylanders favored laws banning inter-racial marriage, compared to 33% for the country as a whole.
- Only 14% of Marylanders favored segregated housing, compared to almost 30% for the country as a whole.
- Only 44% of Marylanders agreed that "Black people should not push themselves where they're not wanted", the figure for the country as a whole was 61%.

On each of these questions, then, Marylanders' responses were 15-20 percentage points more tolerant.

While these figures do not reflect the different age, educational and regional character of the Maryland population, more detailed analysis indicates that these factors alone do not explain the more tolerant responses of Marylanders in the survey. In particular, Marylanders were more tolerant than individuals from other states in the South Atlantic region of the country, that is states below the Mason-Dixon line.

Moreover, white Maryland survey respondents also endorsed more tolerant explanations to a GSS series of questions dealing with why Black people in this country have worse jobs, income and housing than White people. Compared to the country as a whole, whites in Maryland were less likely to say that the disadvantaged economic position of black people was due to personal factors (i.e. "lack of motivation or will power") or genetic factors (i.e. "less inborn ability to learn") and slightly more likely to explain the worse conditions of blacks in terms of lack of education. At the same time Marylanders were also less likely to explain the poorer conditions of black life mainly in terms of discrimination.

On other questions from the GSS and other national surveys, the responses of Marylanders were more similar to national figures. Roughly the same proportion of Marylanders said they would go out of their way to avoid black neighborhoods as was true nationally. Very much the same was found concerning perceptions of blacks and whites of the amount of anti-black and anti-white feeling in the areas that they lived. The latter questions had been asked in a February-March 1981 national telephone survey conducted by the Washington Post and ABC News with 1872 respondents aged 18 and over.

Finally, the thermometer ratings of both blacks and whites in the Maryland survey were quite similar to that found in the 1980 Election Study conducted with 1614 respondents aged 18 and up by the Center for Political Studies at the University of Michigan. For example, respondents in the national survey rated "poor people" 75.2° on the scale compared with 75.0° in Maryland; nationally Southerners rated 66° vs. 69° in Maryland and nationally the Moral Majority rated 45° vs. 47° in Maryland. The major difference was that the gap between Maryland white and black perceptions of the other race (8° and 10°) was somewhat smaller than is found for the nation as a whole (12° and 17°). This may be taken as a further indicator of the greater mutual respect across races expressed in the survey in this state.

TABLE V

R1. Do you think there should be laws against marriages between (Negroes/Blacks) and whites? (Whites only)

	Spring 1982 GSS (n=1350)	Spring 1980 GSS (n=1326)	1980 (Middle Atlantic) (n=221)	1980 (South Atlantic) (n=235)	Fall 1981 Maryland (n=406)
Yes	33.0	31.4	(22.7)	(55.9)	16.4
No	67.0	68.6	(77.3)	(44.1)	83.6
	100.0	100.0	(100.0)	(100.0)	100.0

R2. White people have a right to keep blacks out of the neighborhood they live in and blacks should respect that right.

	Spring 1982 GSS (n=1350)	Spring 1980 GSS (n=1326)	1980 (Middle Atlantic) (n=221)	1980 (South Atlantic) (n=235)	Fall 1981 Maryland (n=406)
Yes	29.6	33.1	(31.2)	(50.4)	14.3
No	70.4	66.9	(68.8)	(49.6)	85.7
	100.0	100.0	(100.0)	(100.0)	100.0

R3. Black people should not push themselves where they're not wanted.

	Spring 1982 GSS (n=1350)	Spring 1980 GSS (n=1326)	1980 (Middle Atlantic) (n=221)	1980 (South Atlantic) (n=235)	Fall 1981 Maryland (n=406)
Yes	60.7	68.2	(55.8)	(82.9)	44.4
No	39.3	31.8	(44.2)	(17.1)	55.6
	100.0	100.0	(100.0)	(100.0)	100.0

TABLE V (cont'd)

If you were driving through neighborhoods in a city, would you go out of your way to avoid going through a section where black people lived. (Whites only)

Category	Survey Research Center Maryland, 1982 (N=406)	GSS 1977 (N=1326)
No	59.9	60.9
Yes	29.2	39.1
Qualified	10.8	--

Most people agree that, on the average, Blacks have worse jobs, income, and housing than Whites. Do you think the differences are: (READ LIST) (Whites Only)

	GSS 1977		March 1981 Washington Post/ABC News		December 1981 Survey Research Center	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Mainly due to discrimination?	41.0	58.9	39.6	60.4	30.5	69.5
Because most Blacks have less in-born ability to learn?	26.1	73.9	23.7	76.3	20.3	79.7
Because most Blacks don't have the chance for the education it takes to rise out of poverty?	50.5	49.4	55.1	44.9	55.8	44.2
Because most Blacks don't have the motivation or will power to pull themselves out of poverty?	65.8	34.2	61.1	38.9	46.9	53.1

Table V (cont'd)

20. In the area where you live, do you think today there is more, less or about the same amount of anti-Black feeling among whites as compared to 4 or 5 years ago?

Category	Survey Research Center Whites (N=406)	Survey Research Center Blacks (N=111)	Category	ABC News/Washington Post Whites	ABC News/Washington Post Blacks
More	14.3	19.2	More	14.3	22.2
Same	45.3	42.4	Same	46.2	36.7
Less	40.4	38.4	Less	39.5	41.1

13. Now how about anti-Jewish feeling in the area where you live, do you think today there is more, less, or about the same amount of anti-Jewish feeling compared to 4 or 5 years ago?

Category	Survey Research Center Whites (N=406)	Survey Research Center Blacks (N=111)	Category	ABC News/Washington Post Whites	ABC News/Washington Post Blacks
More	7.8	12.6	More	5.9	9.6
Same	66.0	49.4	Same	56.1	42.5
Less	26.2	37.9	Less	38.0	48.9

TABLE V (cont'd)

COMPARISONS OF TEMPERATURE RATINGS

CATEGORY	MICHIGAN NATIONAL ELECTION STUDY 1980			MARYLAND STUDY 1982		
	Total N=1614	Whites N=1228	Blacks N=166	Total N=532	Whites N=406	Blacks N=111
Poor People	75.2	73.4	87.9	75.0	72.2	84.6
Southerners	66.2	65.6	72.4	69.2	68.7	71.8
Whites	77.4	77.4	79.2	77.5	78.9	73.2
Blacks	64.2	60.7	90.9	71.2	68.6	81.4
Moral Majority	45.3	43.8	60.5	47.4	43.9	62.0
Hispanics	57.8	57.0	66.1	64.8	63.1	71.1

Most people agree that, on the average, Blacks have worse jobs, income, and housing than Whites. Do you think the differences are: (READ LIST) (Whites Only)

	GSS 1977		March 1981 Washington Post/ABC News		December 1981 Survey Research Center	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Mainly due to discrimination?	41.0	58.9	39.6	60.4	30.5	69.5
Because most Blacks have less in-born ability to learn?	26.1	73.9	23.7	76.3	20.3	79.7
Because most Blacks don't have the chance for the education it takes to rise out of poverty?	50.5	49.4	55.1	44.9	55.8	44.2
Because most Blacks don't have the motivation or will power to pull themselves out of poverty?	65.8	34.2	61.1	38.9	46.9	53.1

TABLE V (cont'd)

A Difference by Age	Interracial Marriage 1980 GSS	Interracial Marriage 1981 Maryland	vs. Open Housing 1980 GSS	vs. Open Housing 1981 Maryland	Blacks shouldn't push 1980 GSS	Blacks shouldn't push 1981 Maryland
AGE						
18-19	13 %	27 %	29 %	36 %	58 %	55 %
20-29	18	5	27	8	60	31
30-39	21	6	25	8	56	33
40-49	31	13	29	13	77	38
50-59	38	19	40	13	74	54
60-69	51	31	42	22	81	67
70+	52	55	51	40	77	72
A Difference by Education						
EDUCATION						
Less than high school	55	44	48	29	82	76
High school grad	30	19	35	18	72	53
Some college	17	9	23	10	59	43
College grad	9	5	20	5	49	18
Grad school	3	2	11	4	39	15

One of the most important findings in the Maryland study that is replicated with this national study is the evidence of some turnaround (backlash) among the younger age groups. Nonetheless, it is clear that the results for young adults in the Maryland study is far more pronounced than for the nation as a whole. Thus, on the open housing question, 36% of 18-19 year olds in Maryland approved it compared to only 8% of those aged 20-29, a turnaround of 28 percentage points; nationally that turnaround was only two percentage points (29% among those aged 18-19 vs. 27% of those aged 20-29).

At the same time, these analyses of subgroups make it clear that age and education are the major predictors of racial attitudes among whites -- both in Maryland and in the nation as a whole. That has perhaps been the main reason for improved racial attitudes over the last decade. If the age turnaround among youngest adults continues, there is cause for concern about the steady progress toward racial harmony that has been well underway since the 1960s.

SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

(1) We have not exhausted the analysis of data we have from this study. While we have looked at some variables from the perspective of the distributions of the responses, cross-tabulations, and multiple classification analysis, other techniques and other studies are as limitless as a reseacher's thoughts and time allow.

The data from this study will be stored on computer tape and available for research at the University of Maryland. The Survey Research Center will encourage anyone who accesses this data to make their work available to the Task Force.

We urge the Task Force to repeat this study - repeating many of the same questions - on a periodic basis as data over time gives considerable insight into any trends or changes occurring in public opinion.

(2) A next step in the study of this problem would be a closer look at the persons who are involved in these incidents we have been talking about -- cross burnings, swastika painting or other defamation of religious buildings. This would necessitate a different type of study from the telephone interviews used in this attitudinal survey; personal, in-depth interviews with persons charged with and/or convicted of such acts, prehaps expanding from these to persons not known to the authorities to be involved. This would be aimed at understanding and probing why such acts are committed and by what types of persons.

MARCH 1982, P.O. 4157

MARYLAND SURVEY ON VIOLENCE AND EXTREMISM

Conducted by

The Survey Research Center

University of Maryland

for

THE GOVERNOR'S TASK FORCE ON VIOLENCE AND EXTREMISM

Executive Summary

September 1982

Maryland Survey on Violence and Extremism

Executive Summary

INTRODUCTION

Governor Harry Hughes established the Governor's Task Force on Violence and Extremism in March 1981 to make certain that State government, in carrying out its responsibilities, would not condone incidents associated with racial, ethnic or religious bigotry.

Comprised of representatives from all three branches of government, the Task Force was given the following charges:

1. Assess each appropriate state department regarding the internal structure and method of serving the citizens of Maryland and make recommendation for changes.
2. Promote a standardized system of identifying and reporting racial, religious or ethnic incidents of violence or intimidation and develop an effective system of law enforcement, human relations and education programs to address the issue.
3. Address education, victim assistance and prevention at the State and local levels.

To carry out these general responsibilities requested by the Governor, the Task Force, at its inception, established projects and objectives which would assist in meeting those responsibilities. Included was the following:

Through the use of appropriate surveys and studies determine with all possible accuracy the dimensions of the problem of racial, religious or ethnic bias or hatred in Maryland.

No basic data was available to the Task Force, either nationally or within the State. The Task Force, therefore, commissioned the Survey Research Center of the University of Maryland to conduct a racial incidents survey of Maryland residents.

The Racial Incidents Survey, perhaps the first one conducted in the country, was done, primarily, to assist the Task Force efforts to define the problem and examine possible patterns of racial and ethnic hostility. The survey might also examine attitudes and activities, as a prelude to possible steps to deal with the recent resurgence in these types of activities.

This survey was not intended to provide all of the answers, nor to ask all of the questions. It has been part of that first important step of providing data for the State of Maryland on an issue which affects not only our present lives but which has important implications for the future quality of life in Maryland. It is, indeed, the first "snapshot" of public opinion on this issue.

METHODOLOGY

The survey questionnaire was administered to individuals over age 18 in a random probability sample of households in the State of Maryland. Interviewing was conducted by telephone during the period from November 15, 1981 to January 15, 1982. The resulting

sample included 532 citizens; of whom 406 identified themselves as "white" or Caucasian, 111 as "black" or Negro and the remaining 15 classified as "other" (mainly people of Oriental background). Only residential households were interviewed.

The survey was conducted by trained interviewers of the Survey Research Center. Completed interviews in this project ranged from ten minutes in length to a maximum of sixty minutes. Confidentiality and anonymity were assured to each respondent in the introductory part of the interview.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

White Attitudes toward Black People

The overwhelming majority of Maryland citizens in the sample disapproved of incidents which reflect racial or religious bigotry. Most citizens also felt such incidents should not be tolerated but should be dealt with by legal means and community pressures. While few respondents saw government leaders at the national or state level as approving of such incidents, substantial proportions perceived them as not caring much one way or the other. More specifically:

- When asked whether they approved or disapproved of cross-burning as an activity, over 90% of white adult respondents disapproved; of these well over half said they strongly disapproved. Less than 1% of respondents in the survey said they approved, although about one respondent in ten didn't care much one way or the other about such activities.

- Similarly, less than 3% of respondents see government leaders in Washington or in Annapolis as approving of such activities. However, more substantial proportions saw these leaders as not caring one way or the other. Over four in ten (41%) see that as the reaction from Washington and 22% as the reaction from Annapolis.

.More than two-thirds white respondents had heard about incidents of cross-burning, swastika paintings, etc. in Maryland. Respondents varied in their explanations why these incidents were occurring, many seeing them as a result of the frustration of difficult economic conditions and unemployment, others seeing it as a result of racist attitudes and organizations and others seeing it as part of the general pattern of rising violence in American society. Almost 9 in 10 in all groups, however, felt something should be done about them; more preferring some form of legal action.

White respondents also expressed tolerant/favorable attitudes toward Blacks in response to specific questions about racial policy issues. Relatively few Whites accepted general stereotypes of Blacks as unambitious, undependable or untrustworthy. Even fewer Whites supported laws against intermarriage of Blacks and Whites or opposed open housing policies in general. While almost half of the Whites did argue that "Blacks should not push themselves where they're not wanted", a large proportion of these agreed because no group in society should. Almost 4 respondents in 10, however, said they would avoid driving through a black neighborhood.

More specifically:

.When asked whether white people or black people "try to get ahead more", two-thirds said race made no difference; less than a third of Whites said Whites and only 2% said Blacks. On a similar question about which race was more dependable, the proportion of "no difference" responses rose to almost 80%.

.When asked to choose whether black people could be trusted or that one "can't be too careful" in dealing with Blacks, only 15% chose the too careful alternative. Almost a third of respondents volunteered the response that race made no difference in such matters. Almost identical responses were obtained to a question asking whether Blacks would try to take advantage of Whites.

.Only 14% of Whites agreed with the statement "There should be laws prohibiting marriages between Blacks and Whites" and only 16% agreed that "White people have a right to keep Blacks out of (white) neighborhoods and Blacks should respect that right."

.Only 13% of Whites felt that had "anything special to fear" from black people; most of these apprehensions stemmed from fear of crime by Blacks.

.In contrast, 44% of Whites agreed with the statement that "Blacks should not push themselves where they're not wanted". Some 40% agreed they "would go out of their way to avoid going through a black neighborhood", although 11% of these said they would do so only under certain circumstances.

Opinions were not as optimistic for the perceptions of possible racial violence. There were many more respondents who felt that the chances for white racial violence had increased over the previous five years than respondents who felt they had decreased; more respondents also felt the chances for black violence had increased than had decreased. Most white respondents also felt that it was Blacks rather than Whites who had mainly benefited from changes in social legislation over the last 20 years. Nonetheless, only a third felt that these changes had made things worse for Whites and more than 80% felt that the amount of anti-black feeling had decreased or remained the same over the last five years.

More specifically:

.Some 38% of respondents thought the chances for violence among Whites in their area where greater than they were five years ago compared to only 11% who thought chances for white violence had lessened. About half of white respondents thought that chances for white violence was no different than they were five years ago.

.Some 25% of respondents thought that chances for violence among Blacks in their area were greater than they were five years ago compared to 21% who felt chances for black violence had increased. Again, over half felt there had been no change in chances for violence.

.While 82% of respondents felt that changes in the laws regarding employment, housing and education had made things better for black people over the previous 20 years, only 33% felt that the new laws had made things better for white people; another 33% felt they had made things worse for white people. The remaining third felt they had made no difference in the lives of white people, however.

.Roughly four respondents in ten felt that there was less anti-black feeling in their areas than there had been five years previously, compared to 14% who felt that more anti-black sentiment had developed. The remaining 45% detected no difference in the racial climate.

As a way of summarizing racial attitudes, respondents were asked to rate various racial groups and organizations on a "feeling thermometer", a device developed and tested in large-scale national surveys. Respondents in the survey were asked to rate "Whites", and "Blacks", "NAACP", "Ku Klux Klan" etc. on a scale running from 0^{o} (coldest possible feeling) to 100^{o} (warmest possible feeling). Whites not only rated Blacks rather warmly (positively) on this scale, i.e., 69^{o}, but also rated two anti-black organizations -- the Nazi Party and the Ku Klux Klan -- at the bottom of the scale at 9^{o}. While their ratings of white people (79^{o}) was ten degrees higher than their rating for black people, the situation was not too different for the mirror image of Blacks toward Whites, as will be seen in the next section.

Black Attitudes toward White People

Many of these same questions were asked of the black respondents in the sample. Although the sample of Blacks in the survey was rather small, their responses to most questions were quite similar to those found among white respondents. Thus we find that:

.Almost all Blacks disapproved of cross-burning and related activities and generally saw state and national government leaders opposed as well. However, larger proportions of Blacks than Whites saw leaders as not caring one way or the other, with almost two-thirds seeing leaders in Washington as not caring.

.Most Blacks saw no fundamental difference between Whites and Blacks in dependability, ambition and trustworthiness. If they saw a difference, they were generally trustful of Whites and in about the same proportion as Whites trusted Blacks.

Few Blacks opposed the policy of open housing or felt they had anything to fear from Whites; those that did, however, feared white imposition of economic hardships rather than crime by Whites against them (which was the main fear Whites had about Blacks).

.The black rating of white people on the thermometer scale (73^{o}) was almost ten degrees cooler than the black rating of black people (81^{o}).

.Blacks also generally perceived less anti-black feeling in their areas than they had five years previously. Almost half of Blacks also felt that chances for violence among Whites had not changed in the last five years.

However, on other perceptions of the state of racial relations, there were important differences between Blacks and Whites. For example, more Blacks (37%) felt that chances for violence among Blacks were greater than they were five years previously than felt black violence was less (24%); fewer Blacks thought white violence chances had increased (25%) than decreased (28%). This was the reverse of the perception of white respondents, who saw chances for white violence as greater.

A more marked discrepancy in white-black perceptions occurred on the question of who had benefited more from the changes in social legislation during the 1960s and 1970s. In contrast to the overwhelming white perception that Blacks had been the main beneficiary, almost as many Blacks felt that things had improved for Whites (54%) as felt that things had improved for Blacks (61%). Over a quarter of Blacks (26%), in fact, felt that these changes in social legislation had made things worse for Blacks over the last twenty years. These major differences in white-black attitudes could have important implications for expectations and behavior in the future.

Difference within White and Black Population

The above attitudes are not uniform in the two populations. More detailed analysis reveals important differences by educational level, by age, by income levels and by region of the state. As in previous surveys of white racial attitudes, education was the major predictor with college-educated respondents being far more tolerant than those who had not completed high school.

Also as in previous surveys, younger respondents tended to be more tolerant than older respondents; however, there were signs of turn-around, or backlash, among the youngest adult age groups -- especially those under age 20. This may be part of a larger national trend, to be described further below.

Lower income white respondents also expressed less positive attitude, as did respondents who lived in the most urban and most rural parts of the state. In other words it was Whites who lived in the suburban counties (Prince George's, Montgomery, Anne Arundel and Howard) who expressed more tolerant attitudes. Although differences by gender were not great, white women were more tolerant than white men.

Few of these factors seemed to predict attitudes as well within the black population, as best as one can tell given the small sample size. If anything, college-educated Blacks expressed less tolerant attitudes toward Whites than less-educated Blacks. No systematic differences were apparent by age or by income. Unlike the case for Whites, black men were slightly more tolerant than black women. Like Whites, black attitudes tended to be more positive in the suburban areas.

Attitudes toward Other Minorities

The survey also investigated statewide attitudes on other issues involving minorities. It generally did not find great cause for alarm on these issues. More specifically:

- Attitudes toward Jewish people were positive. White respondents rated Jews at 70° on the thermometer scale and black people rated them at 71°, lower than the ratings for white people but not much lower than the ratings for other religious groups like Catholics or Protestants. There was also the general impression that anti-Jewish feeling had decreased or stayed unchanged in the respondents' area over the previous five years.

- Attitudes toward Hispanics and Orientals were also positive, although both groups rated lower (67° for Orientals; 63° for Hispanics) among whites than did Blacks; they were both rated more positively by Blacks (70° and 71° respectively). Almost a quarter of Whites and Blacks, however, did feel that the presence of Hispanics had made things worse for black people. At the same time, few Blacks (5%) felt that they had anything special to fear from Hispanics or Orientals.

Comparison to National Surveys

Many of the questions in the racial incidents survey were taken from those used in national surveys. This allowed us not only to employ questions that had already been fully field-tested in other surveys, but to make comparisons between attitudes in the State of Maryland and in the nation as a whole.

The most complete and long-standing series of racial attitude questions are those that have been asked by the General Social Survey (GSS) conducted by the National Opinion Research Center of the University of Chicago. For the past ten years, the GSS has been asking a series of policy-oriented racial attitude questions dealing with such topics as open housing and school desegregation.

For the three of these questions included on our survey; attitudes of white Marylanders were considerably more tolerant than the rest of the country:

.Only 16% of Marylanders favored laws banning inter-racial marriage, compared to 33% for the country as a whole.

.Only 14% of Marylanders favored segregated housing, compared to almost 30% for the country as a whole.

.While 44% of Marylanders agreed that "Black people should not push themselves where they're not wanted", the figure for the country as a whole was 61%.

On each of these questions, then, Marylanders' responses were 15-20 percentage points more tolerant.

While these figures do not reflect the different age, educational and regional character of the Maryland population, more detailed analysis indicates that these factors alone do not explain the more tolerant responses of Marylanders in the survey. In particular, Marylanders were more tolerant than individuals from other states in the South Atlantic region of the country, that is states below the Mason-Dixon line.

Moreover, white Maryland survey respondents also endorsed more tolerant explanations to a GSS series of questions dealing with why black people in this country have worse jobs, income and housing than white people. Compared to the country as a whole, Whites in Maryland were less likely to say that the disadvantaged economic position of black people was due to personal factors (i.e., "lack of motivation or will power") or genetic factors (i.e., "less inborn ability to learn") and slightly more likely to explain the worse condition of Blacks in terms of education. At the same time Marylanders were also less likely to explain the poorer conditions of black life mainly in terms of discrimination.

On other questions from the GSS and other national surveys, the responses of Marylanders were more similar to national figures. Roughly the same proportion of Marylanders said they would go out of their way to avoid black neighborhoods as was true nationally. Very much the same was found concerning perceptions of Blacks and Whites of the amount of anti-black and anti-white feeling in the areas that they lived. The latter questions had been asked in a 1981 national survey conducted by the Washington Post and ABC News.

Finally, the thermometer ratings of both Blacks and Whites in the Maryland survey were quite similar to that found in the 1980 Election Study conducted by the Center for Political Studies at the University of Michigan. The major difference was that the gap between white and black perceptions of each other (8^{o} and 10^{o}) was somewhat smaller than for the nation as a whole (12^{o} and 17^{o}), a further indicator of the greater mutual respect across races expressed in the survey in this State.

SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

This survey and its results have provided a first, general look at the incidents and citizens' attitudes. It has provided a baseline for future surveys and research.

The data from this study will be stored on computer tape and will be available for further analysis at the University of Maryland. The Survey Research Center encourages open access to the data set. Any follow-up research will be available to the Task Force.

A future study of this problem should include a closer look at the persons who are involved in these racial incidents of interest, namely, participants in cross burnings, swastika paintings or other defamation of religious buildings. This would necessitate a different type of study from the telephone interviews used in this attitudinal survey; personal, in-depth interviews with persons charged and/or convicted of such acts, perhaps expanding from these to persons not known to the authorities. This would be aimed at understanding and probing why such acts are committed and by what types of persons.

Further research should be conducted in the area of incident reporting -- who reports, who does not and why.

The possible reversal of age-related racial attitudes, which showed in the young adult profile, should be scrutinized carefully by the Task Force. If a major goal of the Task Force is prevention, then some focus should be placed in the area of education and research conducted which would include younger participants.

The Task Force on Violence and Extremism is grateful for the time and dedication given this survey by the University of Maryland's Survey Research Center; in particular, Dr. John Robinson and Sue Dowden. Never expecting, or anticipating, a panacea, the Task Force has before it the first survey of this nature and will use it as a tool to assist its efforts over the next year.

The full survey report is available by contacting:

The Governor's Task Force on Violence and Extremism
Room H-208
State House
Annapolis, Maryland 21401

SEPTEMBER 1982, P.O 4157